| 1 | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | DICTRICT COLIDT |
| 6 | | UNITED STATES I WESTERN DISTRIC | Γ OF WASHINGTON |
| 7 | | AT SEA | ATILE |
| 8 | DONALD LITTLE, Plaintiff, v. | | |
| 9 | | Plaintiff | |
| 10 | | 1 141111111, |) ORDER |
| 11 | MIKE McGINN, et al., | : |) ORDER |
| 12 | | Defendants. |)) |
| 13 | | |) |

On November 26, 2013, plaintiff filed a "Complaint and Demand for Honor One's Oath of Office, a True Common Law Bill." It is not entirely clear what the nature or factual basis of plaintiff's claim is: he may be seeking (a) to execute on an unspecified default judgment previously entered against the defendants, (b) to enforce the oaths of office defendants took as officials of the City of Seattle, (c) to obtain damages related to the impoundment/theft of a vehicle, and/or (d) to seek redress for a violation of Art. I, § 10 of the United States Constitution. The Court, having reviewed the record as a whole under the standards articulated in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), found the complaint deficient and ordered plaintiff to file an amended complaint establishing this Court's jurisdiction and setting forth sufficient factual allegations to give rise to a plausible claim for relief against the named defendants. Although plaintiff filed a response to the Order to Show Cause, it does not contain any additional factual allegations to support his Art. I, § 10 claim. To the extent plaintiff mentions other federal constitutional provisions, he has not filed an amended complaint asserting claims thereunder, nor has he provided any facts giving ORDER

rise to a plausible inference of liability on defendants' part. For all of the foregoing reasons, the above-captioned matter is hereby DISMISSED. Dated this 8th day of January, 2014. MMS Casuik
Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge

ORDER -2-